DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 375 292 CE 067 449

TITLE Coordination of Job Training Partnership Act and Occupational Education: The Goal--More Effective Services.
INSTITUTION Nevada State Council on Occupational Education, Carson City.
PUB DATE May 93
NOTE 26p.; Document contains small print.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Cooperative Planning; *Coordination; Educational Cooperation; Educational Legislation; Educational Planning; Federal Legislation; Federal Programs; *Job Training; Partnerships in Education; Postsecondary Education; Public Policy; Secondary Education; *Statewide Planning; *Vocational Education
IDENTIFIERS *Job Training Partnership Act 1982; *Nevada

ABSTRACT

In December 1991, the Nevada Workforce Group and Nevada Workforce Agencies (NWA) were formed in an effort to expand/improve joint planning and collaboration between occupational education (OE) and job training (JT) throughout Nevada. The NWA consists of the directors, administrators, or designated representatives of 13 state agencies involved in OE/JT. In August 1992, the NWA undertook a project to assess and extend/improve the coordination of Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) and OE programs in Nevada. Ten points related to enhancing coordination were discussed at six meetings between the NWA and local partners at three sites in northern, southern, and rural Nevada. It was concluded that Nevada's lack of a comprehensive policy for work force development has resulted in fragmented OE/JT efforts largely supported by federal funds. The following actions were recommended: Nevada should develop a structured policy recognizing the need for OE/JT providers to share responsibility for work force development and directing state financial contributions accordingly; the legislative support and state appropriations needed to support coordination should be identified and reported annually; and local recipients of OE/JTPA should submit reports justifying their use of federal funds and summarizing local coordination efforts and activities. (MN)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

Coordination Of Job Training Partnership Act and Occupational Education: The Goal — More Effective Services

May 1993

ED 375 292

CE 067 449

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

M Rask

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Nevada Council On Occupational Education

Eric Beyer, President
Industry

Jeanne Jones, First Vice-President
Small Business/State JTCC

Floyd 'Wayne' Grimes, Second Vice-President
Labor

Charlene Rogerson, Second Vice-President
Special Populations

Claudette Enus, Past President
Industry

Douglas Burris
Postsecondary

Fred Davis
Business

Elsie Doser
Postsecondary

Kathleen Frosini
Secondary

Denny Martindale
Business

John Mathews
Agriculture

Phillip 'Pancho' Williams
Labor

Cliff McClain
Postsecondary

MIchael L. Rask,
Executive Director

Rose Mary Johnson,
Administrative
Assistant

COORDINATION OF JOB TRAINING PARTNERSHIP ACT AND OCCUPATIONAL EDUCATION: THE GOAL - MORE EFFECTIVE SERVICES

Prepared By

The Nevada Council on Occupational Education

In Response To

The Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Education Act of 1990, Section 112, (d)(10)(A)(i)

May 1993

COORDINATION OF JOB TRAINING PARTNERSHIP ACT

AND OCCUPATIONAL EDUCATION:

THE GOAL - MORE EFFECTIVE SERVICES

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION..... Page 1

COORDINATION..... Page 3

COMMENDATIONS..... Page 17

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS..... Page 18

GENERAL REFERENCES..... Page 20

COORDINATION REPORT

Introduction

The Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Act Amendments of 1990, Section 112 (d)(10)(A)(i), requires the State Council on Vocational Education to evaluate at least every two years "the extent to which vocational education, employment and training programs in the State represent a consistent, integrated, and coordinated approach to meeting the economic needs of the State". The charge given State Councils is more complicated than one first perceives. In order to fully respond to the mandate, each Council must first establish the parameters of the evaluation.

Nevada, like many other western rural states, is experiencing a significant growth in both population and employment. Clark County (Las Vegas) is currently one of the fastest growing urban communities in America. While the four major growth areas, Washoe, Elko, Douglas and Clark counties, are experiencing significant increases, the rural counties of the State remain static. The economic needs of Nevada are perceived very differently based upon the area from which one originates. Generalizations relating to occupational education and employment and training, for the most part, are based upon the aggregate needs of the State.

Nevada has become increasingly successful in luring business relocation and expansion into the State. The Reno Chamber of Commerce identifies the Nevada tax structure as the number one reason for business relocation. At the same time the availability of trained and employment-ready population has been a detractor from economic development initiatives. In the Nevada Council on Occupational Education report titled, An Analysis of the Adequacy and Effectiveness of the Job Training Partnership Act and Occupational Education Programs in Nevada dated April 1993, the Council found the systems to be incapable of meeting the need for new and replacement employees given the current demand. The current systems produce approximately 6,800 trained individuals and the 1993 demand was projected to be over 22,000*. At full capacity, the current education and training system in Nevada can meet less than one-third (1/3) of the current State need for new and replacement employees.

---

* (Nevada Council on Occupational Education, An Analysis of the Adequacy and Effectiveness of the Job Training Partnership Act and Occupational Education Programs in Nevada, April 1993, p. 5)

Since the early 1980's Nevada has strived to expand the economic base of the State. The key to expansion was and is business and industry diversification. If Nevada is to maintain its very favorable tax environment (in 1989 Nevada had the third lowest tax rate in America), it must increase the statewide economic base while at the same time increasing the State's gross State product and tax base.

Currently, Nevada is importing the majority of the skilled labor to meet current labor demand. The population flow from outside of Nevada has contributed significantly to the State's population growth and the demand for public services. Nevada is unable to effectively train its young people for high skill jobs, forcing them to migrate to areas where skill competition is less demanding, or to pursue training outside the State.

In order to meet the economic needs of the State, job training and occupational education must meet the needs of current and future employers for trained and productive employees. To meet the needs of the State in a governmental sense, the current demand for employees must be met by educating, training, or retraining the State's current residents. To continue the flow of skilled employees from outside the State will only result in ever increased demand for already over burdened public services.

Three key words govern the mandate given to each State Council; "consistent, integrated and coordinated approach to meet the economic needs of the State". For 15 years the Nevada Council on Occupational Education has evaluated and reported upon the State's ability to meet its own manpower needs. Since 1986 the Council has observed and commented on and made recommendations regarding coordination of services for workforce development. Public job training in Nevada has for the past 15 years been funded solely by Federal appropriation. First, through the Manpower Development and Training Act, then the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act, and now the Job Training Partnership Act. Nevada has never contributed significantly to the training or retraining of its socially dependent population except through the community college system.

Nevada has relied heavily on the Federal vocational education appropriations to bring change and expansion to secondary and postsecondary occupational programs. Beyond a very small general operational appropriation, Nevada makes no continuing contribution to occupational education program improvement or support for program expansion or innovation.

Being dependent solely upon federal funds for "training" and occupational education designated funds, operations of programs have remained distinctly separated under the authority of the governing agencies and boards. Programmatically, integration has not occurred in Nevada and will not occur due to the authorities established in State statutes for operations. There being no

State funds appropriated specifically for programs and considering the autonomy of operations granted each agency, state board and local board of education, it is unlikely integration will occur on a broad basis. The one shining exception to the history of programs in Nevada has been through the Job Training Partnership Act 8% setaside for education and the use of Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Education Act, to attack specific population problems through integrated use of funds and establishment of programs. The success of the Single Parent and Displaced Homemaker Centers has served as a model for joint effort.

Coordination

In May of 1992, the Council issued a report titled, Creating Greater Incentives for Joint Planning and Collaboration Between Occupational Education and Job Training. The report was an effort to bring about the establishment of an administrators coordination group to give leadership to cooperative efforts among agencies. The Council submitted the following endorsements and recommendations:

ENDORSEMENT 1

"Responding to the ever increasing call of business and industry involvement in reports like America 2000, and the purposes of the JTPA and the Carl D. Perkins Act, the Nevada Council endorses the continuance of the State Job Training Partnership Coordinating Council, Private Industry Councils, State Technical Committees, and the State Council on Vocational Education. This structure was created by Congress to provide for third party (private sector) assessment, recommendations, and reporting for the improvement of programs.

RECOMMENDATION 1

After researching the recommendations made by the Nevada State Council on the effectiveness of coordination between the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) and vocational education since 1981, the Nevada Council supports the concept of a Human Resource Investment Council (HRIC) composed of the state level administrators of:

A. The Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Education Act
B. The Job Training Partnership Act
C. The Adult Education Act
D. The Wagner-Peyser Act

E. Title IV of the Social Security Act (JOBS)
F. Section 6 of the Food Stamp Act of 1977
G. The Higher Education Act
H. The Elementary and Secondary Education Act
I. The Emergency Immigrant Education Act
J. The Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act

The HRIC should be chaired by the Governor or the Governor's designee, not eligible under administrative categories. Each member of the HRIC should be authorized to expend funds from their state administrative set-aside to support the operational costs of the HRIC.

RECOMMENDATION 2

It shall be the responsibility of the HRIC to develop and monitor a Coordination Plan. The Coordination Plan will be developed by the HRIC, and therefore, those individuals administratively capable of making change in each of the related program plans and/or contracts.

The Coordination Plan should include the following:

A. The HRIC shall develop a written cooperative agreement for use with participating agencies governing authorities;
B. A description of all common participant goals (i.e. job placement, career exploration, placement services, etc.) for all federally supported human resource development efforts;
C. A description of current activities conducted regardless of funding source(s);
D. Where common goals exist and program standards are established, uniform definitions of program participant eligibility shall be used when like sources of funds are available to serve such participants;
E. Development of a granting process within the state which will guarantee common distribution of grant proposal information;
F. A priority for funding of programs that demonstrate operations in support of multiple funding sources; and
G. Development of an evaluation process which should be used to evaluate programs that have been coordinated with the HRIC."

The need to coordinate services extends well beyond the programmatic operations of Job Training and Occupational Education. Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) administrators have been required to coordinate planning and services with many

of the agencies cited for participation. Barbara Weinberg, Director of the Nevada Job Training Office, noted that the most successful coordination has arisen from client necessity and the inability of one agency to finance full service. Mandated coordination will, in fact, result in documentation of activities, but it is the effort to provide meaningful services with highly limited financial resources which will result in true coordination.

Federal policy and legislation, existing and proposed, will result in an ever increasing linkage between job training, as administered by the Department of Labor, and vocational education, administered by the Department of Education. Current regulatory efforts and administrative policy have driven JTPA youth programs to expanded summer efforts, reducing year-round efforts and requiring the academic programs to be provided by the public school system.

The State Council strongly endorses recent initiatives undertaken to foster expanded coordination in Nevada. The organization of the Nevada Workforce Group is a credit to each of the agencies who contribute to the overall effectiveness of workforce preparation in Nevada.

The development and operation of the Nevada Workforce Group is central to the Council's assessment of coordination. The preliminary report prepared on the first year of operations has been included in this report for clarity.

A Statewide Initiative For Coordination - In December of 1991, Nevada Governor, Bob Miller, convened a group to discuss strategies to enhance the equality of Nevada's workforce. The individuals were representatives of boards and councils which became known as the Nevada Workforce Group (NWG), and the administrators of agencies which are identified as the Nevada Workforce Agencies (NWA).

Chairs of the following boards and councils are represented in the Nevada Workforce Group (NWG):

Commission on Economic Development	Lt. Gov. Sue Wagner
State Board of Education	Carley Sullivan
Employment Security Advisory Council	Paul Havas
State Job Training Coordinating Council	Jessie Emmett
Vocational Rehabilitation Advisory Board	Kathy Ferguson
State Industrial Insurance System Board of Directors	Rabbi Mel Hecht

University and Community College System Board of Regents	Carolyn Sparks
State Welfare Board	Gigi Hay Chisel

Directors, administrators or their designees of the following State agencies are represented in the Nevada Workforce Agencies (NWA):

Department of Data Processing	Karen Kavanau
Commission on Economic Development	Cecilia Colling
Department of Education	Dr. Eugene Paslov
Employment Security Department	Stan Jones
State Job Training Office	Barbara Weinberg
State Library and Archives	Joan Kerschner
State Occupational Information Coordinating Committee	Valorie Hopkins
Commission on Postsecondary Education	David Perlman
Rehabilitation Division, Department of Human Resources	Steve Shaw
State Industrial Insurance System	Carl Swain
University and Community College System of Nevada	Doug Burris
Welfare Division, Department of Human Resources	Jackie Cheney
Office of the Governor (Ex Officio)	Coni Longero

Dr. Doug Burris, representing the University and Community College System was selected as the NWA's first chairman. The NWA met throughout 1992 and established a process for coordinating activities at the State level. The NWA also developed, secured funding for, and initiated a project to extend that coordination to the local level, at which the front-line services to clients are provided.

The purposes, objectives and operations of the NWG/NWA were detailed in the document titled, Report to the Nevada Workforce Agencies and the Nevada Workforce Group, January 1993 and prepared by Simon and Associates.

> "The purpose of the Nevada Workforce Agencies is to provide a structure for interagency coordination and to serve as liaisons from the agencies the members represent.
>
> Both the Nevada Workforce Group and the Nevada Workforce Agencies are voluntary,

advisory coalitions of individual representatives working together; neither is an organization itself.

Goal - The goal of the Nevada Workforce Group/Nevada Workforce Agencies is to enhance the quality of Nevada's current and future workforce by improving service to clientele, including employers and employees, through interagency coordination.

Objectives - The following objectives were adopted to further the stated goal:

- To increase knowledge regarding the human resource development missions of related agencies.

- To increase knowledge regarding the clients of related agencies.

- To establish procedures for ongoing interaction.

- To determine long term and short term coordination priorities.

Operating Guidelines establish for the NWA - Membership:

- Initial members of NWA are the directors/ administrators or their designees of the following agencies:

  Data Processing
  Economic Development
  Employment Security
  Welfare
  Rehabilitation
  State Industrial Insurance
  University and Community College
  Occupational Information Coordinating Committee (SOICC)
  Education
  Job Training
  Library

- The Office of the Governor is an ex officio member of the NWA.

- New member agencies may be added as appropiate.

Meetings:

- Regular meetings of the NWA will be held at least bimonthly or as needed to achieve the goals of the NWA during the organizational year (7/1/92-6/30/93).

- The Nevada Workforce Group shall meet at least annually to review the activities of the NWA.

Leadership:

- The Chair of NWA serves an annual term from 7/1 to 6/30 each year.

- The Chair rotates annually in alphabetical order by agency in the order listed under "Membership".

- The Vice Chair is a member following the Chair on the Membership list.

- The Vice Chair conducts meetings in the absence of the Chair.

- Ad Hoc Committees may be established as appropriate.

Philosophy:

- NWA is advisory and voluntary and operates by consensus to promote effective, efficient service to clients.

Project Development - Through a federal grant to the State Job Training Office, funds were obtained to hire a consultant to coordinate the initiation of the NWA's goals and objectives on a statewide basis. The consulting firm of Simon and Associates was selected by award of bid, and discussions of the project scope between the consultant and the NWA were begun in August 1992.

The NWA determined that the project objectives could most effectively be met by extending the coordination already in place among State agency administrators to their local counterparts in the northern, southern, and rural areas of the State. Each agency administrator selected local counterparts who were to be invited, by a letter from Governor Miller, to each of two local meetings.

Two meetings were held with each local area agency group in northern Nevada, southern Nevada and the outlying area as follows:

Reno	October 5 and November 10, 1992
Las Vegas	October 6 and November 4, 1992
Elko	October 16, and November 12, 1992"

The meetings held by the NWA and the follow-up meetings conducted at the local level were reported in the 1993 Nevada Work Group Summary.

"Present Level of Coordination - Examples of effective coordination exist in all areas of the State and provide a strong foundation for continued efforts in this regard. While there may be comparable activities performed by different agencies throughout the State, they are often provided to different populations or are different segments of broad tasks. Agencies demonstrated a strong willingness to look at coordination whenever the possibility exists that comparable activities are delivered to the same populations. It should be noted that this report is a summary of future opportunities, and not a comprehensive audit of current coordination.

Examples of the existing coordination include coordinated assessment among Vocational Rehabilitation, Employment Security, SIIS, Department of Prisons, Parole and Probation and School Districts; coordination of activities between Economic Development groups, School Districts, Community Colleges and JTPA (Job Training Partnership Act) agencies; coordination of training activities provided by JTPA and Welfare agencies; and many other specific examples of local program coordination.

One of the most extensive coordination efforts at the local level will be the planned Nucleus Plaza resource center in Las Vegas, which organizers hope will be a cooperative effort between Nevada Business Services (a JTPA agency), State Welfare, the Community College of Southern Nevada, Nevada Employment Security Department, the Learning Center (a private sector entity), Clark County Social Services Department and other agencies. The resource center hopes to have some elements of the intake process coordinated.

Many obstacles to coordination currently exist. These include regulatory and funding source requirements that mandate the same or a similar activity to be done by different agencies in slightly different ways; technological incompatibilities; competition for limited funding; the time, effort and physical distances required for coordination in a situation of scarce resources; the different uses of terminology from agency to agency; the various interpretations of authority among agencies; and the existence of underlying territoriality.

Opportunities for Enhancing Coordination - There are essentially four levels of interagency coordination possible, listed in order of increasing difficulty:

I. Coordination of Staff - This includes activities such as interagency meetings and task forces, shared inservice trainings, etc.

II. Coordination of Data and Information - This includes pooling or sharing information that multiple agencies use, with the goal of improving service to clients. This can be done either electronically, verbally, or manually. Two major obstacles to coordination of data are technology and confidentiality laws. Technological solutions are costly but possible if the confidentiality issues are resolved. New legislation is needed in Nevada to clarify public agencies' capacity to share information on behalf of a client. Questions which must be addressed include the following: Is it the citizen's data or the government's? Does government have the right to share citizen data without the citizen's specific consent? What constitutes specific consent, if it is required? What data is confidential and what data is not?

III. Coordination of Programs and Services - This includes such activities as one agency providing services to clients of another agency by agreement, as well as designing programs and services of different agencies as an organized curriculum to better meet the clients' needs. It may also include cross-enrollment of clients in one agency's programs for programs of another agency, or coordinating resources such as space, equipment and expertise in the delivery of programs and services.

IV. Coordination of Policies and Procedures - This includes analyzing current and proposed policies and procedures to eliminate those which prevent appropriate coordination among agencies, where possible. Because some of those policies which inhibit coordination are federal and therefore outside the jurisdiction of the State, this task is a long-term one.

Coordination at all four levels exists and can be improved upon. Some coordination activities will necessarily be more difficult and take longer than others, because they are more resource-intensive or require action by others outside of State government.

All groups at the local level indicated an interest in continuing to meet, and they reported that the meetings had enhanced their awareness of the missions and services of other agencies and had provided ideas for improving services to clients through coordination. Staffing to support continued meetings, including activities such as distribution of meeting notices and minutes, is an issue of concern to the local groups, particularly in the outlying areas. Any support that can be provided at the State level will be helpful in maintaining the local level meetings.

Sharing basic client information, perhaps electronically or through the use of shares

"face sheet" in the different agency application processes, was identified as a priority for improving intake and referral services to clients. Enhanced sharing of confidential client information is a highly controversial issue and will require clarification by the Attorney General's Office of the legal limits and requirements of interagency information exchange. Further, as stated above, new legislation will be needed to effectively address this opportunity to improve service.

Referral among the many agencies that may serve a client already exists at varying levels of formality and effectiveness. An opportunity to improve the effectiveness of referrals may come from strengthening procedures for giving feedback about the outcome of the referral to the agency that referred the client initially.

The groups expressed interest in developing a common method or methods of evaluating client outcomes statewide. A uniform definition of what constitutes completing a program of service would be needed. Separate evaluation criteria would probably be needed for each of the different categories of service provided by agencies, including information and referral, income maintenance during job seeking and job training, and education and training services.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

The local partners of the NWA were invited to explore ten points of coordination, with the goal of sharing ideas and information throughout the State and further supporting interagency coordination. The following is a summary of common themes of the discussions on each of the points of coordination. A complete summary of the local discussions is available as supporting material in the full report; it must be noted that it is a report of discussions, feelings and beliefs of the attendees, and is not edited for accuracy of those beliefs.

A. Development of procedures for local interagency working committees to meet/share/

coordinate/orient on a regularly scheduled basis.

- All groups acknowledged the value of the meetings and indicated their intent to continue meeting. They all expressed the need for administrative support to enable them to meet while continuing to balance existing priorities.

B. Development of an overlay of available client education, training, employment and support services by type and location.

- Directories of service exist throughout the State; all local groups are committed to continuing to improve them as appropriate.

C. Identification of exemplary coordination as well as opportunities for improved coordination.

- Many examples of excellent coordination are found throughout the State. Agencies are to be commended for the level of coordination that exists, and all indicated their willingness to continue exploring additional avenues of coordination.

D. Review of intake processes, basic client data needs, and eligibility documentation requirements.

- Coordinating intake information and processes was acknowledged as a goal by all groups. Sharing of client information is a necessary first step in coordinating intake processes, and this will require clarification by the Attorney General's Office of the legal limitations and requirements. New legislation will be needed to support this effort.

- The Nucleus Plaza resource center in Las Vegas hopes to have coordinated intake. This pilot effort will provide much-needed experience for expanding coordinated intake to other areas of the State.

E. Review of assessment processes and multi-agency acceptance and use.

- Coordination of assessment is currently being done among Vocational Rehabilitation, Employment Security, SIIS, the Department of Prisons, Parole and Probation, School Districts and others in some areas. Federal legislation will formalize multi-agency acceptance of assessments among JTPA, Vocational Rehabilitation and School Districts.

F. Review of resource sharing, i.e., testing expertise, labor market information, employment information.

- Information sharing is good for the available information. Interest exists in expanding labor market supply and demand information. Information on specific job opportunities is guarded due to the competition among agencies to find placements for their clients in a tight job market.

  - Sharing of expertise occurs but is informal.

G. Development of an effective referral mechanism.

- Referral is good and can be improved by formalizing feedback on the outcome of the referral to the referring agency. Groups in the north and south of the State are working on the development of a common referral form to strengthen the process.

- An immediate avenue for improving referrals may be through increased cross training of front-line workers to improve knowledge of the missions, services and basic eligibility guidelines of other agencies.

H. Review of case management mechanisms to assure client access to all available resources.

- Case management, in the sense of a single worker assigned to coordinate all

possible services for a single client, does not exist, but through enhancement of referrals as mentioned above, the desired objectives of case management may be achieved.

I. Development of a reporting mechanism to identify service coordination.

- This was identified as a lower priority goal by all groups, and would be an item for future discussions.

J. Development of a system for evaluation of client outcomes.

- All groups expressed an interest in improving measurement of client outcomes and shared the difficulty of common evaluation systems in the absence of a definition of what constitutes completion of a program of services. Additionally, tracking the clients of these agencies over time and geography is a challenge in evaluating outcomes, as is the existence of conflicting evaluation requirements among different agencies funded by the State and the Federal government. All groups expressed a willingness to continue working on this objective and indicated their desire to avoid creating another layer of reporting requirements.

FUTURE AGENDA

At the State level, items identified which merit additional study and/or action include the following:

Future Interagency Meetings - The NWA will continue to meet and has a formal structure in place to expand its cooperative efforts. In addition, the NWA will continue to facilitate meetings of the local counterparts. In some cases, local counterparts are County departments, not reporting to State officials. The voluntary cooperation of these agencies has been a significant component of the success of local coordination and should be encouraged. The NWA will also review proposed legislation during the coming Legislative Session to ensure

that the goal of interagency coordination is supported.

Sharing Client Information - All agencies agreed that services to clients would be improved by sharing more client information, and they are interested in exploring methods for sharing information, either manually or electronically. Efforts to provide electronic linkages were enthusiastically supported.

Further clarification is needed from the Attorney General's Office, however, regarding what information may be shared among agencies, under what circumstances, and what would constitute an acceptable release of information form for agencies to use in giving clients the opportunity to have their information shared. Additionally, as mentioned, new legislation will be needed.

Interagency Referral Processes - The referral process is active in all areas of the State. All participants were committed to improved referral, and they identified that consistent, formalized feedback to referring agencies regarding the outcome of referrals was a low-cost opportunity for immediate improvement in the referral process.

Common Measures for Evaluating Client Outcomes - There is great interest in improving the evaluation of outcomes in all agencies. Further discussions will be needed to develop common definitions of what constitutes completion of programs, what constitutes "training", and what constitutes a unit of service in each agency.

Policy and Procedure Review - Program specialists from each agency should meet to explore ways to improve coordination in existing and future policies and procedures in their respective agencies."

The findings of the NWA vary little from previous findings of the Council as it relates to existing coordination. The past theme of coordination has been informality and dependency on individuals' willingness to work together, and the availability of time on the part of program administrators. The study conducted by the NWA is the most exhaustive ever undertaken in Nevada to define the current status of broad-based coordination, and to analyze the current barriers to greater efforts.

In the 1989 Biannual Report of the Nevada Council on Occupational Education, the assumption of duplication of effort and programs at the State level on the part of Federal agencies was discussed. Like the findings of the NWA, the Council found little duplication of effort between Job Training and Occupational Education. Where there was duplication, the clients and students varied so greatly that what appears as duplication of programs was necessary to service all the varied populations described in Federal law.

The efforts of the NWA represent a new beginning for coordination in Nevada. In the 20-year history of the Nevada Council on Occupational Education, there has never been such an effort to coordinate services. Nevada is a state heavily dependent upon Federal programs to meet the workforce needs of the State and the education and training needs of the residents of the State. The Council believes that this most recent effort to coordinate what is largely federally supported programs, is truly motivated by an effort to make maximum use of very limited resources geared toward preparing a viable workforce for Nevada.

Prior to the completion of the 1992 work of the NWA, the Nevada Council on Occupational Education had undertaken a process to assess the extent and viability of coordination between Job Training and Occupational Education. Survey and interview instruments were developed which paralleled the efforts of the NWA. Realizing the obvious duplication of effort in assessing the status of coordination, the Council opted to follow up on the NWA initiative and to delay further study until the efforts at the State and local levels could be assimilated.

COMMENDATIONS

1. THE NEVADA WORKFORCE GROUP AND NEVADA WORKFORCE AGENCIES ARE TO BE COMMENDED FOR THEIR LANDMARK EFFORTS TO GIVE STATEWIDE LEADERSHIP TO COORDINATION OF WORKFORCE PREPARATION SERVICES.

2. ACKNOWLEDGING THEIR ALREADY HEAVY WORKLOAD, THE COUNCIL GIVES SPECIAL COMMENDATION TO BARBARA WEINBERG, DIRECTOR, OF THE NEVADA JOB TRAINING OFFICE, DR. DOUG BURRIS, VICE CHANCELLOR, UNIVERSITY AND COMMUNITY COLLEGE SYSTEM OF NEVADA, AND DR. KEITH RHEAULT, DIRECTOR OF THE

OCCUPATIONAL AND CONTINUING EDUCATION BRANCH OF THE NEVADA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION, FOR THEIR PERSONAL LEADERSHIP TO THE EFFORTS OF THE NWA AND ITS SUPPORT ACTIVITIES.

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

FINDING 1

The State of Nevada workforce development has followed federal legislation and the funds provided through that legislation has dictated State Workforce (Manpower) Policy. The absence of a uniform State policy for workforce preparation has led the State to a focus on programs geared to special needs populations, which are now the central focus of federal initiatives on education and training. The lack of a comprehensive policy for workforce development has resulted in a fragmented effort largely supported by federal funds. Where State funds do exist, occupational education priorities always fall far below academic education priorities. There being no policy for training, little or no State funds are considered for this priority.

RECOMMENDATION 1

THROUGH THE LEADERSHIP OF THE NEVADA WORKFORCE GROUP MEMBERS REPRESENTING THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION, NEVADA UNIVERSITY BOARD OF REGENTS AND THE STATE JOB TRAINING COORDINATING COMMITTEE, TO THE GOVERNOR, THE STATE COUNCIL ON OCCUPATIONAL EDUCATION RECOMMENDS THE DEVELOPMENT OF A COMPREHENSIVE POLICY FOR WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT IN NEVADA. THE POLICY ESTABLISHED SHOULD RECOGNIZE THE NEED FOR CONTINUATION OF EACH AGENCY BASED UPON THE UNIQUE PURPOSES FOR THEIR EXISTENCE BEYOND THE COMMON RESPONSIBILITY OF WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT, AND PROVIDE A STRUCTURED POLICY WHICH WOULD DIRECT FUTURE STATE FINANCIAL CONTRIBUTIONS TO WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT.

FINDING 2

In order to effect major change in the delivery of workforce development services, some State Legislature changes will be necessary. An example of an area of concern as identified will be clarification of public agencies' capacity to share information on behalf of clients. Another may be the use of State appropriated funds to be used as match for future multi-agency grants.

RECOMMENDATION 2

THE STATE COUNCIL RECOMMENDS TO THE NWG THAT CONSIDERATION BE GIVEN TO THE SUBMISSION OF AN ANNUAL PROGRESS REPORT TO THE LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL BUREAU. EACH ANNUAL REPORT SHOULD INCLUDE RECOMMENDATIONS OF SUPPORT LEGISLATION AND STATE APPROPRIATIONS AS NEEDED.

FINDING 3

The success of the initiatives for coordination is heavily dependent upon the agencies represented on the NWA continuing their leadership to the local agencies. Periodically, the State agencies will need to reinforce the coordination efforts of their local counterparts. Reporting of efforts to coordinate should become a regular part of the process of making application for federal funds provided for occupational education and training.

RECOMMENDATION 3

THE STATE COUNCIL ON OCCUPATIONAL EDUCATION RECOMMENDS TO THE STATE BOARD FOR OCCUPATIONAL EDUCATION AND THE STATE JOB TRAINING OFFICE THAT PERFORMANCE REPORTS SUBMITTED BY LOCAL RECIPIENTS IN JUSTIFICATION OF USE OF FEDERAL FUNDS INCLUDE A SUMMARY OF LOCAL EFFORTS AND ACTIVITIES WHICH SERVE THE GOALS OF COORDINATION AS DESCRIBED BY THE NEVADA WORKFORCE GROUP.

GENERAL REFERENCES

* Anonymous, Clinton's Labor Budget Shows Preference for Youth Training, Vocational Training News, Capital Publications, Alexandria, Va., April 15, 1993.

* Benson, Charles S., Order Amidst Complexity: The Status of Coordination Among Vocational Education, Job Training Partnership Act, and Welfare-to-Work Programs, National Center for Research in Vocational Education, University of California, Berkeley, Ca., August 1990.

* Nevada Council on Occupational Education, An Analysis of the Adequacy and Effectiveness of the Job Training Partnership Act and Occupational Education Programs in Nevada, Carson City, Nv., April 1993.

* Nevada Employment Security Department, Nevada Occupational Projections, 1991-1996, NESD Employment Security Research, September 1992.

* Simon, Katy, Executive Summary Report to the Nevada Workforce Agencies and the Nevada Workforce Group, Simon and Associates, Reno, Nv., January 1993.

Nevada State Board of Education

Yvonne Shaw. President
Sparks

Liliam Hickey, Vice President
Las Vegas

Peggy Lear Bowen
Carson City

Frank Brown
Carson City

Carley Sullivan
Elko

William Hanlon
Las Vegas

Patricia Krajcech
Henderson

Carol Lenhart
Las Vegas

Marianne Long
Las Vegas

Steve Stallworth
Las Vegas

Terry Garcia-Cahlan
Las Vegas

Jill Van Buskirk
Las Vegas